



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Iran," and in the discovery that "in American democracy we find all the characteristics of primitive democracy." Such statements are out of place in the present stage of historical research. But M. Laveleye is an economist, not an historian, and his work suffers thereby.

If the chapters which treat historically of primitive forms of land holding were cut out and a careful excision were made of many comments and deductions, then the remainder of the work would have a considerable value. For M. Laveleye has brought together a large amount of information which may or may not represent to us the system employed by Indo-European peoples in the early stages of economic development. Such information not readily accessible regarding land cultivation and ownership, has a value apart from that here given to it, for it is too heterogenous in character, and of too recent a date to be available for the application of the comparative method. Therefore the main thesis of the book remains as it was before unproven.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

---

OUR SHEEP AND THE TARIFF. By WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS, Fellow of the Wharton School of Finance and Economy. Publications of the University of Penna. Vol. II of the Political Economy and Public Law Series. Pp. 158. Philadelphia: University of Penna. Press, 1890.

In view of the importance of the tariff controversy on the one hand, of the extraordinary growth of political and economic studies in our Universities on the other, it is surprising that our institutions of learning should have contributed so little to the sober and unbiassed consideration of the burning question. Within the last year or two, however, there have been signs of greater attention to the topic. The volume before us is an evidence of this change, and a gratifying one. Mr. Lewis's study is a distinct contribution to our knowledge of the subject he treats, and in tone and temper shows a great advance over the usual discussion of it, whether by the advocates or opponents of the duties on wool. He has gathered a wide range of information, largely by inquiry

and correspondence among those actively engaged in raising wool or dealing in it, and has presented his facts in interesting form. Even those who may not accept his conclusions will read his pages with interest and profit. His tone shows the result of scientific training : he is cool and straightforward.

Mr. Lewis's general conclusions are, that the retention of the present duties on clothing and combing wool is desirable ; but he intimates that there are no good grounds for retaining those on carpet wool. The reasoning on which the conclusion in favor of retaining the duties on the finer grade of wool is based, is of two sorts : partly general reasoning as to the effects of import duties, and partly specific inquiry as to the condition and prospects of wool-growing in the United States. So far as the general reasoning is concerned, it is not to Mr. Lewis's discredit to say that it shows the influence of teacher on pupil rather than the marks of independent thought. The working of the law of diminishing returns under the influence of international trade, and the adaptation of the habits and wants of a people to their industrial environment—these are topics on which he is clearly under the influence of Professor Patten, and has added little to the reasoning of that scholar. This is not the place for a discussion of Professor Patten's presentation of the case for protection, of which it can certainly be said that it puts the arguments on a new and less narrow basis, and deserves, more than much of the reasoning generally in vogue, a serious and painstaking consideration. The present writer has not found himself convinced by it when presented by its author, and not more so in the form which it takes in Mr. Lewis's paper ; but to enter here on a statement of the grounds of his opinion would carry him too far afield.

In Mr. Lewis's examination of the concrete conditions of wool-growing in the United States he has more to say that is new ; and indeed this part of the paper seems to hang somewhat loosely on the general reasoning which has just been referred to. The failure of the wool-growers of the United States to supply all the wool the country uses is ascribed to a variety of causes. Partly it is traced to physical causes, such

as difficulties of soil and climate; partly to defective land legislation; partly to ignorance among the farmers as to the advantageous breeds of sheep, and to habits among the farmers that stand in the way of sheep raising, such as the dog nuisance in the South; and partly to general harmful customs, such as the lack of uniformity in grading, the practice of not sorting wool before it comes to market, and so on. Much of the matter here is fresh and helpful, and many of Mr. Lewis's conclusions may be commended without reserve. Mr. Lewis admits that the list of drawbacks is a formidable one and may "lend ammunition to those who assert that we cannot raise wool in this country." Too much stress, in fact, seems to be laid on the miscellaneous difficulties, and on the obstacles of ignorance and custom. The permanent obstacles from climate and general economical conditions, weigh more in the scale than Mr. Lewis would give us to suppose. In the strictly agricultural regions of the United States, where sheep and wool are a by-product of general farming, they will never be raised in great quantities and yet will always be maintained to a certain extent, whether there be a duty or none. In the ranching regions of the West, where alone sheep-raising on a great scale can develop, the greater rigor and greater uncertainty of the climate and the less favorable condition of soil and rainfall, make it probable that Australia, with vast quantities of land which is not fitted for general agriculture and is happily fitted for wool-growing, can supply us for a long time to come with fine wool more cheaply than we can raise the total supply for ourselves.

Useful tables on the production and importation of wool, on the total consumption by the United States, and on the distribution of wool-growing in the world, are incorporated in the volume. There is an excellent account of the mode in which sheep-raising is carried on in Australia, and a brief sketch, not perhaps so satisfactory, of the land legislation of the Australian colonies. An index would have added much to the usefulness of the paper.

F. W. TAUSSIG.

*Harvard University.*